

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, and 10 have been amended herein to clarify applicant's claimed invention. No new matter is entered.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed to an edge node where there is provided an address solution unit (for example 50 in Fig. 2), which includes a tree search circuit together with first route list (52, 54) and a flow search circuit together with second route list (for example 53, 55 in Fig. 3).

By the combination of route information output from the first and second route lists (54, 55), the judgment circuit 56 will determine routing, for example either hardware transfer or software transfer will be determined.

When software transfer is determined at the address solution unit 50, the software transfer is executed through a software processing unit (64 in Fig. 2).

**Specification**

The specification page 19 is objected to. The band control parameter is referring to Fig. 5 item 80 which in fact, based on Fig. 5 should be referring to 82. Based on Fig. 5, the specification has been corrected to reflect the drawing. No new matter is entered.

**Claims**

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated by Bechtolsheim, et al., U.S. patent 6,377,577 (hereafter Bechtolsheim).

The Office Action points to Fig. 1 of Bechtolsheim for the access control element 120 to describe applicant claimed finding a second route information. In applicant's combining step the Office Action points to column 2, lines 47-50 which describes access control without the need

for software processing. The Office Action also points to column 5, lines 1-10 which describes software processing by a higher-level processor.

In contrast to applicant's claimed invention Bechtolsheim specifically recites in column 2, line 47 to 50 that there is no need for software processing. Applicant claims combining the first and the second route information to judge if the IP packet should be transferred to the execution of software.

The Office Action also points to col. 5, lines 1-10 to teach software processing by a higher-level processor.

However col. 4, lines 48-67 describes that "[t]he indicator provided to the output port 202 specifies whether or not the packet 130 has permission to be forwarded from its specified source device 131 to its specified destination device 132. In a preferred embodiment, the indicator specifies one of three possibilities: (a) the packet 130 is forwarded to its calculated output interface and on to its specified destination device 132; (b) the packet 130 is dropped; or (c) the packet 130 is forwarded to a "higher-level" processor for further treatment. (emphasis added).

Thus it is indicated from output port 202 from the priority encoder which specifies the software process.

In contrast applicant claims: combining the first and the second route information to judge if the IP packet should be transferred to the execution of software.

Contrarily to applicant Bechtolsheim disclose access control list processing in hardware, in which there is provided routing element 110, which uses a CAM and access control element 120, and fail to suggest software processing for routing. Particularly, Bechtolsheim indicate no need for software processing (see column 2, line 47 to 50).

Applicant's independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 each include a similar feature, therefore, it is respectfully requested the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated by Bechtolsheim be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers

Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-8703

Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987

Docket No.: FUJH 19.221 (100794-00099)

BSM:rm